

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed August 29, 2006. Claims 17 and 43-45 are cancelled and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 13, 25, 27, and 37 are amended. Claims 1-16 and 18-42 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to claims 3, 5, and 8 alleging that the claim terminology "may be" is imprecise and makes the claims ambiguous. Claims 3, 5, and 8 have been amended to replace the term "may be" with the term "is". As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3, 5, and 8 are precise and not ambiguous and respectfully request that the objections to claims 3, 5, and 8 be withdrawn.

II. Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. According to the Examiner on page 5 of the Office Action, "Ackley does not mention using a window or substrate made of glass. In the examiner's opinion, it would not have been obvious to modify Ackley to use a substrate made of glass absent Applicant's own teachings. This particular feature in combination with the other recited elements of claims 4 and 17 are deemed allowable

over the prior art of record.” In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13, 25, 27, and 37 to include the element of a window comprising glass or substrate comprising glass as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, claims 1, 13, 25, 27, and 37 are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons set forth by the Examiner regarding claims 4 and 17. Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1, claims 14-16 and 18-24 depend from claim 13, claim 26 depends from claim 25, claims 28-36 depend from claims 27, and claims 38-42 depend from claim 37. As such, claims 2-12, 14-16, 18-24, 26, 28-36, and 38-42 are also believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1, 13, 25, 27, and 37. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-16 and 18-42 be withdrawn at least for the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action.

The Applicant’s submit the following comments concerning the Examiner’s statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the claimed inventions of claims 4 and 17 are patentable over the prior art, but respectfully disagrees with the Examiners statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in Office Action. Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicant’s do not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner’s statement in the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 15th day of January, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/David A. Jones/ Reg. # 50,004

DAVID A. JONES

Registration No. 50,004

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

Telephone: (801) 533-9800